

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the thorough examination of the present application as reflected by the Office Action. Applicant submits that the present application is in form for allowance for the reasons discussed below. The rejections in the present Office Action substantially correspond to those in the preceding Office Action. Accordingly, for the Examiner's convenience, only new issues will be addressed herein. However, to assure that this submission is fully responsive, Applicant's previous Amendment is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth in its entirety.

The Drawing Objections:

The drawings continue to be objected to for the same reasons as the previous Office Action. Office Action, p. 2. While Applicant's submit those objections are not supportable, a proposed drawing change is shown in the attached redlined drawing sheet 2/8, including FIG. 2A. Should the Examiner accept this proposed revision as meeting the objection, Applicant will submit a replacement drawing sheet and amend the paragraph at page 9, lines 21-26 of the specification as follows:

Figures 7A-7C illustrate that the audio driver circuit **127** of the electronic circuit **120** can be coupled to the flat-panel speaker **130** through a balanced feed **1001** (FIG. 2A). As is known to those of skill in the art, the term "balanced feed" refers to transmitting a differential signal over leads having positive and negative voltages, rather than leads representing signal and ground voltages, in order to reduce the susceptibility to noise either internally generated by the wireless terminal or external noise.

If this proposal is not acceptable, Applicant again requests some suggestion of an acceptable change from the Examiner as Applicant fails to understand the basis for the Examiner's objections.

The Response to Arguments section of the Office Action includes no discussion of Applicant's comments on the second drawing objection. Office Action, p. 2. As stated in Applicant's previous Amendment with respect to the objection to the usage of 135R and 137R, these numbers refer to an "RF isolation circuit," different possible configurations of which are shown in Figures 7A and 7B, respectively. In contrast, the

In re: Hayes
Serial No. 10/632,320
Filed: August 1, 2003
Page 8 of 9

"inductor 710, 715" as contrasted with the "tank circuit 720, 725" are differently numbered as they reference particular configurations of an RF isolation circuit. If this does not overcome the objection, Applicant requests clarification and/or a suggested amendment from the Examiner that would address this objection.

The Prior Art Rejections:

Claims 15 and 27-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0024271 to Ying *et al.* ("Ying"). Office Action, p. 4. Claims 1-14 and 16-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious, over Ying. Office Action, p. 5. The Response to Arguments section only addresses Applicant's argument that Ying does not disclose a flat panel speaker and states "Ying et al clearly teach the flat panel speaker (23) (Fig. 1)." Office Action, p. 2.

As stated in the present specification:

One way to meet the demand for a reduction in the size of personal electronic devices is to use flat-panel speakers in place of the conventional speakers. Flat-panel speakers vibrate air using a large, thin conductive diaphragm panel, rather than the traditional cone-shaped panel, and, therefore, require less space.

Specification, p. 1, lines 22-25. Thus, flat panel speakers are a particular type of speaker. Applicant submits that, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Ying does **not** teach such a flat panel speaker. Item 23 is never referred to in Ying as a flat panel speaker. Item 23 is merely shown as a rectangle in the figures of Ying. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide some explanation for how reference simply to a speaker and a schematic illustration of a rectangle can possibly teach such a flat panel speaker if the rejections are not withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons discussed above, the references cited in the present rejections do not disclose or suggest the present invention as

In re: Hayes
Serial No. 10/632,320
Filed: August 1, 2003
Page 9 of 9

claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all the pending claims and passing this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Glatz
Registration No. 36,811

Customer No. 54414
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec
P.O. Box 37428
Raleigh, NC 27627
(919) 854-1400 phone
(919) 854-1401 fax

Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on January 10, 2006.



Carey Gregory

481635